UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/519,242	03/06/2000	Carl Herman Haken	CH2000A	8274

7590 11/02/2004

Carl Haken
5 Oid Neversink Road
Danbury, CT 06811

EXAMINER	
TRAN, MYLINH T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/519,242
Filing Date: March 06, 2000
Appellant(s): HAKEN, CARL HERMAN

Jack E. Haken
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 07/08/04.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The brief does not contain a statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief. Therefore, it is presumed that there are none. The Board, however, may exercise its discretion to require an explicit statement as to the existence of any related appeals and interferences.

The brief does not contain a statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief. Therefore, it is presumed that there are none. The Board, however, may exercise its discretion to require an explicit statement as to the existence of any related appeals and interferences.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) Grouping of Claims

The appellant's statement of grouping of claims in the brief is correct.

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

6,219,027	Shimizu et al.	345/145
6,388,658	Ahern et al.	345/168
2001/0045914	Bunker	340/53
6,252,544	Hoffberg	

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al. [US. 6,219,027] in view of Ahern et al. [US. 6,388,658].

As to claims 1, 13 and 14, Shimizu et al. discloses a first processor which functions to generate a first image of a first graphical desktop user interface and a first display screen disposed at a first screen location and connected to the first processor to display the first image (see abstract, figure 9 (D1) and column 5, lines 19-43); a first pointing device connected to the first processor to control movement of a first cursor in the first image (column 6, lines 52-62); second visual display means and which are displeased at a second display location which is movable in relation to the first display screen location of the first display screen (figure 9, (D1, D2), column 5, line 62 through column 6, line 8); means which determine a first relative direction, from the first display screen to the second visual display means (column 7, lines 9-52 and column 8, lines 20-40) and program means which expand the display of graphical desktop user interface onto the second visual display means at times and the second visual display means are also in the vicinity the first display screen so that movement of the first pointing device in the first relative direction causes the first cursor to move to and to disappear at an edge of first display screen)and further causes the appearance of a new visual indication on the second visual display means (column 2, line 56 through column 3, line 15 and column 9, lines 10-50). The applicant's

attention is directed to figure 7, a cursor is moved from point (a) of a first display (D 41) to point (A) of a second display (D 42). Shimizu et al. also cites "when the cursor of the mouse 23 is moved from the display device D41 to the display device D42 or vice versa, the cursor changes its position differently depending on the position of the cursor on a source screen" (column 3, lines 39-45); and "The pointing device 2 is used to move a cursor 3 between the plurality of display devices (1-1)-(1-n)" (column 5, lines 21-25); and "Since the ratio between the pixel pitch on the display device D1 and the pixel pitch on the display device D2 is 2:1, the cursor display position moves regularly across the display devices D1 and D2" (column 8, lines 23-26). The differences between Shimizu et al. and the claim is a second processor with the second display to move in relation to the first display screen and means for communicating signals between the first processor and the second processor means. Ahern et al. shows multiple computers with plural displays means (see abstract and column 5, lines 50-63 and column 7, lines 52-60) and means for communicating signals at figure 1A, column 5, lines 50-63 and column 7, lines 52-60. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shimizu et al. and Ahern et al. before them at the time the invention was made to modify the concept of movement the pointing device between two different displays shape taught by Shimizu et al. to include the multiple processors with displays of Ahern et al., in order to provide users an image display system in which a user can control

information display on multiple display devices with a single pointing device as taught by Ahern et al.

As to claim 2, while Ahern et al. shows multiple computer processors with plurality of display, Shimizu et al. teaches movement of the first pointing device in the first relative direction causes the first cursor to move to and disappear off an edge of the first display screen in a direction toward the second visual display means and to apparently seamlessly appear as a new cursor on the second display screen (column 7, lines 9-59 and column 8, lines 3-53).

As to claim 3, Shimizu et al. also shows the new cursor appears at an edge of the second display screen that is oriented toward the first display screen (column 19-43).

As to claim 4, Shimizu et al. teaches the first pointing device further functions to control movement of the new cursor on the second display screen (column 6, line 53 through column 7, line 17).

As to claim 5, Shimizu et al. also teaches the first cursor to reappear on the first display screen whenever the new cursor is moved off the edge of the second display screen in a direction toward the first display screen (column 8, lines 33-53).

As to claim 6, Shimizu et al. demonstrates the first pointing device controls the appearance and apparent movement of the new visual indication on the second visual display means (column 10, lines 40-53).

As to claims 7 and 8, Although Shimizu et al. does not explicitly mention communicating being a docking cradle attached at an edge of the first display screen for supporting the second processor means and the means which determine comprise means which sense that the second processor means being in the cradle, it is notoriously well known in the state of the art because the docking cradle is just a container which holds a device such as a palm system. The examiner takes **OFFICIAL NOTICE** of this teaching. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shimizu et al. before him, to modify the container of the palm system to be the docking cradle, as made known in the state of the art.

As to claims 9 and 10, Although Shimizu et al. does not explicitly mention the means for communicating being a wireless interface, for determining comprising a directional antenna array, the means which communicating being an infrared light interface and the means which determine being directional infrared sensors, it is notoriously well known in the state of the art because nowadays there are plural of devices or systems communicating each other without a wire and being an infrared light. The examiner takes **OFFICIAL NOTICE** of this teaching. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shimizu et al. before him, to modify plural systems communicating each other wirelessly to be a wireless interface system and determining comprising a directional antenna array, as made known in the state of the art.

As to claim 11, Shimizu et al. shows the second visual display means comprising one or more indicator lights. The indicator light could be the on/off button of the second display (figure 9).

As to claim 12, Ahern et al. teaches the second processor means is a device selected from the group consisting of: personal data assistants, laptop computers, digital cameras, audio players, video games, cordless telephones, cellular telephones, television receivers, VCR's and scanners (video, column 2, lines 53-65 and column 4, lines 20-35).

(11) Response to Argument

Appellant has argued that "neither the Shimizu patent nor the Ahern patent describe or suggest a system or method which can determine the relative direction from a first display screen to a second display device". However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees because the Shimizu's system has to determine the relative direction in order for the cursor knows which direction it should moves. How can the cursor turn to the left (from D2 to D1, figure 9) instead of turning to the right? Why does it move to the right of the display D2? Because the system determines the direction for the cursor to move, it should move to the left from D2 to D1. Therefore, it is clear that Shimizu discloses the step of determining the relative direction from the first display screen to the second display screen.

Appellant also argues neither the Shimizu patent nor the Ahern patent describe or suggest a system or method wherein a cursor on a visual display is caused to move to

and disappear off an edge of a first display screen with the appearance of a new cursor on a second screen. However, Shimizu discloses the feature at figure 9, where the cursor disappears off an edge of the display D2 and appears of a new cursor on the display D1. The cursor image on D2 is a place where the cursor is located before it.

As for claim 8, in response to the appellant request for document supporting the official notice, the limitation "docking cradles" is disclosed in US 6,252,544. The reference teaches a PDA (personal digital assistant) which its cover is the docking cradle.
As for claim 9, in response to the appellant request for document supporting the official notice, the limitation "a directional antenna" is disclosed in US 2001/0045914, line 0054, 0069.
As for claim 10, in response to the appellant request for document supporting the official notice, the limitation "a directional infrared array" is disclosed in US 2001/0045914, line 0005-0006.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Mylinh Tran
November 1, 2004

Conferees
Joseph Field

Steve Hong

Ba Huynh

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Carl Haken
5 Oid Neversink Road
Danbury, CT 06811